UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/47/PV.91
19 January 1993

ENGLISH

Forty-seventh session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 91st MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 18 December 1992, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. GANEV (Bulgaria)

- Policies of Apartheid of the Government of South Africa [33] (continued]

  (a) Report of the Special Committee against Apartheid

  (b) Report of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa

  (c) Report of the Commission against Apartheid in Sports

  (d) Reports of the Secretary-General

/...

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

92-62249 3612V (E)

(e) Report of the Special Political Committee

(f) Draft resolutions

(g) Report of the Fifth Committee

- United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa [34] (continued)

(a) Report of the Secretary-General

(b) Draft resolution

- The Situation in Central America: Procedures for the Establishment of a Firm and Lasting Peace and Progress in Fashioning a Region of Peace, Freedom, Democracy and Development [36] (continued]

(a) Report of the Secretary-General

(b) Draft resolution

(c) Report of the Fifth Committee

- Emergency International Assistance for the Reconstruction of War-Stricken Afghanistan [141] (continued)

- (a) Draft resolution

- (b) Report of the Fifth Committee

- Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization [10] (continued)

(a) Reports of the Secretary-General

(b) Draft resolution

- The Situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina

(a) Report of the Secretary-General

(b) Draft resolution [143] (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 33 (continued) AND 34 (continued)

POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA

(a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID (A/47/22)

(b) REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL GROUP TO MONITOR THE SUPPLY AND SHIPPING OF OIL AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS TO SOUTH AFRICA (A/47/43 and Add.1)

(c) REPORT OF THE COMMISSION AGAINST APARTHEID IN SPORTS (A/47/45)

(d) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/47/525, A/47/559, A/47/574)

(e) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/47/616)

(f) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/47/L.27, A/47/L.29, A/47/L.31, A/47/L.32, A/47/L.44 and Corr.1, A/47/L.45 and Corr.3, A/47/L.46)

(g) REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/47/798)

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA

(a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/47/513)

(b) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/47/L.15)

The PRESIDENT: Members will recall that the draft resolution submitted under agenda item 34 was introduced at the 62nd plenary meeting, on 17 November, that the debate on agenda items 33 and 34 was concluded at the 66th plenary meeting, on 19 November, and that the seven draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 33 were introduced at the 88th plenary meeting, on 15 December.

We will now turn to consideration of the eight draft resolutions before the Assembly.

I shall first call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting on any or all of the draft resolutions.

(The President)

May I recall that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to ten minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats. Representatives will also have an opportunity to explain their votes after all the votes have been taken.

Mr. TENNE (Israel): South Africa has been part of the rapidly changing world scene for these last few years. While the desired transformation inside South Africa is not yet complete, the positive reforms that have taken place thus far were acknowledged by the international community in the drafting of some of the draft resolutions that have been proposed to us.

Curiously, though, some things do not seem to change: the singling out of Israel in the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid and in a separate draft resolution. This is anachronistic, unnecessary, unfair, untrue and unacceptable. It is, I believe, very instructive to note that the Government which is the prime instigator of this exercise is neither African nor remotely interested in either the eradication of apartheid or the well-being of its victims. And it is absurd that those who really are committed to eliminating apartheid should acquiesce in the cynical misuse of their grief and condone this exercise by going along with it.

The time has come to put an end to the discrimination against Israel through name-calling in this case, as has been done in other cases. Its continuation casts a dark shadow not on Israel but on those who practise this discrimination, and clearly undermines the international effort and consensus against apartheid.

My delegation will therefore vote against draft resolution A/47/L.45 and Corr.3, on the relations between South Africa and Israel, and urges all delegations which reject apartheid and discrimination to do the same. Similarly, my delegation is unable to support draft resolution A/47/L.29, on the programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid, which refers to the Special Committee's discriminatory report and recommendations.

(Mr. Tenne, Israel)

However, my delegation has no wish to undermine a possible consensus on this issue in view of the importance we attach to the other aspects of the Special Committee's programme of work. My delegation will therefore join a consensus on draft resolution A/47/L.29, should this prove possible, while expressing its strong reservations on the report's name-calling.

Mr. GRIFFIN (Australia): This explanation of vote is delivered on behalf of Canada, New Zealand and Australia. Our three delegations will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution on military and other collaboration with South Africa (A/47/L.44 and Corr.1). Our vote is not a judgement on the substance of the draft resolution, which is close to that of a resolution on the same subject which we supported last year, resolution 46/79 C, and which is consistent with the managed approach to military, financial and other sanctions agreed by Commonwealth Heads of Government at their meeting in Harare in October 1991.

Rather, our vote reflects our concern at the manner in which this and another draft resolution under this item have appeared before the Assembly, particularly at such a late stage. The issues canvassed in this draft resolution are already incorporated in a form that attracts the support of all Member States, in the consensus omnibus draft resolution (A/47/L.32), which is sponsored by the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid and which was the subject of broad consultations.

As three countries deeply concerned about the situation in South Africa, we participated actively and in good faith in those consultations. One of our objectives has been to support the streamlining of the resolutions adopted

(Mr. Griffin, Australia)

under this item so as to send a clear, focused and unanimous message from this Assembly at a critical time in the political process of eradicating apartheid.

The late appearance, without broad consultation, of competing draft resolutions which are not able to attract consensus and which therefore cut across the work of the Special Committee is not helpful, in our view.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the eight draft resolutions before it. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of these draft resolutions has been issued as document A/47/798.

I should like to inform the Assembly that the sponsors of the draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 33 have requested that the Assembly take up the draft resolutions in the following order: A/47/L.32, A/47/L.29, A/47/L.27, A/47/L.31, A/47/L.44 and Corr.1, A/47/L.45 and Corr.3, and A/47/L.46.

May I take it that the Assembly agrees to take up the draft resolutions in that order?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: After all the votes have been taken on the seven draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 33, we shall proceed to take action on the draft resolution submitted under agenda item 34.

(The President)

I should like to announce that the Islamic Republic of Iran has joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/47/L.27; the Islamic Republic of Iran and Mozambique have joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/47/L.44; the Islamic Republic of Iran and Sudan have joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/47/L.45; the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Mozambique have joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/47/L.46; Angola, Belarus, Indonesia, Malaysia, Morocco, Mozambique and Thailand have joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/47/L.15.

The General Assembly will first take a decision on draft resolution A/47/L.32, "International efforts towards the total eradication of apartheid and support for the establishment of a united, non-racial and democratic South Africa".

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution A/47/L.32?

Draft resolution A/47/L.32 was adopted (resolution 47/116 A).

The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution A/47/L.29, "Programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid".

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/47/L.29 was adopted (resolution 47/116 B).

The PRESIDENT: We now turn to resolution A/47/L.27, "United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa".

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/47/L.27 was adopted (resolution 47/116 C).

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will next take a decision on draft resolution A/47/L.31, "Oil embargo against South Africa".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Swaziland, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/47/L.31 was adopted by 111 votes to 1, with 44 abstentions (resolution 47/116 D)*.

---

* Subsequently the delegations of Ethiopia, Liberia and Senegal advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will next take a decision on draft resolution A/47/L.44 and Corr.1, "Military and other collaboration with South Africa".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/47/L.44 and Corr.1 was adopted by 106 votes to 2, with 47 abstentions (resolution 47/116 E)*.

---

* Subsequently the delegations of Ethiopia, Liberia and Senegal advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will next take a decision on draft resolution A/47/L.45 and Corr.3, "Relations between South Africa and Israel".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Belarus, Benin, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominica, Fiji, Japan, Kazakhstan, Myanmar, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Republic of Korea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/47/L.45 and Corr.3 was adopted by 93 votes to 39, with 23 abstentions (resolution 47/116 F)*.

---

* Subsequently the delegations of Ethiopia, Liberia and Senegal advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution A/47/L.46, "Support for the work of the Commission against Apartheid in Sports".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/47/L.46 was adopted by 121 votes to none, with 39 abstentions (resolution 47/116 G)*.

---

* Subsequently the delegations of Liberia and Senegal advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The PRESIDENT: Lastly, we turn to draft resolution A/47/L.15, on the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt this draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/47/L.15 was adopted (resolution 47/117).

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives who wish to make statements in explanation of vote or position.

May I remind delegations that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. HICKS (United States of America): Let me begin by reaffirming our appreciation and admiration for the leadership that Ambassador Gambari and the Special Committee against Apartheid have shown in reaching consensus on this year's omnibus anti-apartheid resolution. We believe this year's omnibus resolution is an excellent one. As in years past, Ambassador Gambari has led the international community in achieving language that reflects realistically both the problems and the promise in South Africa.

This year we joined the consensus on the resolution on the programme of work. The resolution commends the efforts of the Special Committee, and in that respect we concur. Our decision was not an easy one, and was taken in recognition of Ambassador Gambari's leadership and cooperation in securing an omnibus resolution that all parties can find acceptable, as well as his expressed commitment to the dissolution of the Special Committee. My Government welcomes Ambassador Gambari's unequivocal statement, made before this body on 15 December when he introduced the draft resolution, that

> "the Special Committee will not perpetuate itself after the discharge of its mandate." (A/47/PV.88, p.85)

(Mr. Hicks, United States)

We also note Ambassador Gambari's clear definition of when that mandate would be considered ended.

As South Africa inevitably moves towards non-racial democracy, all parties must reassess their role in the fight against apartheid. We strongly believe that once South Africa becomes a non-racial democracy, the Special Committee's goal will have been accomplished. At that point, decisions on internal issues should be subject to a future Government, and not to others. Furthermore, the work of facilitating a peaceful and stable transition in South Africa and redressing the social and economic consequences of apartheid can be taken over at that point by existing United Nations agencies and programmes.

The work of the Special Committee has improved much over the past years, and there has been greater political progress towards a united, non-racial, democratic South Africa. We believe this resolution should have included a clause calling for a review of the mandate of the Special Committee, with a view towards its dissolution in the light of further developments in South Africa. My Government hopes that language to that effect will be included in any future resolution on the programme of work.

I wish to take this opportunity to condemn, in no uncertain terms, the recent acts of terrorism against innocent civilians in King William's Town and Queenstown. As members know, the Azanian People's Liberation Army (APLA), the armed wing of the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC), has claimed "credit" for these attacks. The PAC, however has taken no action to discipline APLA, much less criticize its actions. If the PAC wishes to play a constructive role in the transition to a non-racial, democratic South Africa, it must speak out

(Mr. Hicks, United States)

immediately and unequivocally against these acts of terrorism. As we have said in the past, we condemn all acts of violence and all loss of innocent lives.

My Government feels strongly that United Nations support for the PAC, so long as it does not disassociate itself from APLA's reprehensible actions, is incompatible with the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. We urge the Special Committee to suspend financial support for the PAC Observer Mission in New York until the PAC disassociates itself from the terrorist strategy of APLA and assists proper authorities in apprehending the perpetrators of these acts.

As I noted earlier, our decision to join the consensus on the programme of work was not an easy one. I would like to stress that a "yes" vote this year in no way commits us to a "yes" vote next year. We are pleased that we have been able to move from an abstention to today's "yes" vote. We hope the Special Committee will be able to make commensurate progress in objectively tackling the issues before it.

(Mr. Hicks, United States)

I should also like to make it clear that our vote in favour of the resolution on the programme of work does not in any way indicate that we accept the offensive practice of singling out in the report of the Special Committee Israel's relations with South Africa. We reiterate our strongly held belief that name-calling has no place in General Assembly resolutions. As in years past, my Government must again object to the tone and substance of this year's resolution on relations between South Africa and Israel.

Let me, in conclusion, reiterate once more that my Government is pleased with the overall progress that the General Assembly has achieved towards moving to less contentious and more helpful resolutions regarding issues in South Africa. We hope that this trend will continue at the next session.

Mr. RICHARDSON (United Kingdom): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Community and its member States.

Our views on agenda item 33 were set out in full in our statement in the debate on 18 November. We are pleased to point out that since then the European Community and its member States were able to participate fully in the negotiations that resulted in the important consensus resolution on apartheid. This resolution represents a useful advance on last year's, and sends a positive, united signal from this Assembly to the parties in South Africa.

We wish to express our gratitude to the Chairman of the Special Committee, Ambassador Gambari of Nigeria, for the skilful and positive manner in which he steered the negotiations on this resolution and for the unstinting work that he has done throughout the year to promote consensus. Supported by

(Mr. Richardson, United Kingdom)

the Director of the Centre against Apartheid, Ambassador Gambari's efforts to make the work of the Committee more relevant and supportive of positive peaceful change within South Africa were reflected in the recommendations of this year's much-improved report on the work of the Special Committee, and they have been welcomed by us all.

As a tribute to that work, the decision to join the consensus on the resolution on the programme of work of the Special Committee this year has been unanimous within the European Community. We have common views on several important aspects of that work. In particular, we share the appreciation, expressed in operative paragraph 1 of the resolution, for those parts of the report that deal with the Special Committee's work, under its mandate, in support of the peaceful eradication of apartheid.

We regret, however, that not all parts of the report serve that purpose - for example, the continued references to relations between South Africa and Israel and military cooperation, which, together with the resolutions on those subjects, we all deplore.

For the first time, all States members of the Community have abstained in the voting on the draft resolution concerning the oil embargo against South Africa. Several member States do not consider the General Assembly to be the appropriate body to establish and monitor an embargo. Moreover, a decision was taken by the European Community and its member States on 6 April 1992 to lift its own oil embargo, in recognition of the gradual progress made by the Government of South Africa towards the eradication of apartheid.

Returning to the work of the Special Committee, we would have preferred to see in the resolution itself a firm reference to the need for the Committee

(Mr. Richardson, United Kingdom)

to complete its work and to be dissolved once the end of apartheid is achieved. However, we are pleased to note Ambassador Gambari's clear statement that the Special Committee will not perpetuate itself in office after the discharge of its mandate, which he has said will be ended when a new non-racial and democratic constitution is in place in South Africa and free and fair elections are conducted on that basis.

Like him, we hope and expect that next year will see more progress in the situation on the ground and in the efforts of the international community to support that progress.

Mr. OZAKHAEV (Russian Federation) (interpretation from Russian): The Russian delegation is gratified to note that, as a result of intensive consultations, it has been possible to achieve a resolution that reflects a consensus approach by the international community in favour of a speedy solution of the problem of apartheid by peaceful political means. I should also like to express our gratitude to the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid - the permanent representative of Nigeria, Ibrahim Gambari - for his efforts in the course of the consultations towards reaching consensus on the resolution.

The Russian delegation was unable to support the resolution on military collaboration with South Africa, since in addition to its important provisions regarding the need for all States to observe the mandatory embargo imposed by the Security Council on arms supplies to South Africa, it also contains outmoded language not in keeping with the spirit of consensus resolutions of the General Assembly on the question of apartheid.

(Mr. Ozakhaev, Russian Federation)

In our view, the resolution on the oil embargo is likewise at variance with current realities. Unfortunately, it fails to take account of the process of positive change that is taking place in South Africa, and, despite the international consensus on this matter, it contains an appeal for the tightening of measures whose implementation will have a negative impact on the already difficult socio-economic situation of the people of that country. For that reason the Russian delegation abstained in the vote on the resolution.

The resolution on relations between South Africa and Israel also fails to serve the interests of the creation of a favourable situation for the solution of serious international problems, as it is couched in confrontational language. For that reason the Russian delegation voted against it.

Our delegation abstained in the vote on the resolution regarding support for the activities of the Commission against Apartheid in Sports. As representatives are aware, the Russian Federation, as a party to the International Convention against Apartheid in Sports and as a member of the Commission, cannot agree with some of the recommendations contained in the Commission's report - in particular, those relating to the convening of annual sessions - since it believes that, in the present circumstances, a review of the Commission's activities is advisable.

The Russian Federation favours the prompt and final dismantling of apartheid, the full and total guaranteeing of human rights and a peaceful transition to democracy in South Africa. We are firmly convinced that the immediate resumption of the operation of the negotiation machinery will promote the attainment of that end. In that regard, Russia, for its part, is ready to cooperate with the constructive forces in South Africa and with all countries and organizations.

Mr. TRAXLER (Italy): My delegation, while fully endorsing the statement in explanation of vote made by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the European Community and its member States, wishes to make a few additional remarks on the resolution on the programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid, the draft of which is contained in document A/47/L.29.

Italy has just joined the consensus on this resolution in recognition of the emphasis that the text places on the need for a peaceful transition to a democratic and non-racial society in South Africa. Furthermore, in our deliberation we were greatly encouraged by the indication given by Ambassador Gambari, when he introduced the draft resolution on apartheid on 15 December, that the mandate of the Committee will be considered ended when a new, democratic and non-racial constitution is in place in South Africa and free and fair elections are conducted on that basis.

(Mr. Traxler, Italy)

However, my delegation wishes to emphasize that great accuracy will be needed next year in drafting a text on the same subject in order to ensure that the mandate of the Special Committee is commensurate with the objective needs arising from the political changes in South Africa. Italy would indeed have serious reservations about any extension of the mandate of the Special Committee not warranted by developments in the country.

In conclusion, my delegation fervently hopes that in its work the Special Committee will spare no effort in seeking to facilitate a peaceful negotiated transition to a united, democratic and non-racial South Africa and in conveying the extreme urgency of the economic and social recovery of that country.

Mr. CAMILLERI (Malta): Together with the rest of the United Nations membership, Malta has always been, and continues to be, unequivocally opposed to the policies of apartheid. We deeply share the commitment to ensuring the complete elimination of that hateful and degrading system.

In that spirit, my delegation is please to note that the Assembly has for the second year running come to an agreement on the main resolution dealing with the question of apartheid. We see this as an encouraging response to the developments in South Africa, where in spite of many serious difficulties the main parties concerned remain determined to pursue the objective of the total elimination of the abhorrent policies of apartheid and the establishment of a non-racial and democratic system.

My delegation was also pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolutions dealing with the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and with the work of the Special Committee against Apartheid. However, we felt it

(Mr. Camilleri, Malta)

necessary to abstain in the voting on draft resolutions A/47/L.44, on military collaboration with South Africa, A/47/L.46, on the work of the Commission against Apartheid in Sports, and A/47/L.31, dealing with the oil embargo, and to vote against draft resolution A/47/L.45, dealing with relations between South Africa and Israel.

We consider that, in both letter and spirit, those draft resolutions retain elements from the past that are no longer relevant to current realities in South Africa and elsewhere.

Mr. LADSOUS (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation, of course, associates itself fully with the statements made by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the European Community and its member States, both during the debate on this item and in explanation of vote.

Our consideration of the item on apartheid takes place at a time when developments in South Africa are giving rise both to great hope and to anxiety. The beginning of a process of constitutional negotiations in the framework of the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) marked a major stage in the process of abolishing apartheid and establishing a united, non-racial and democratic South Africa. But that process is encountering difficulties that indicate the magnitude of the work still to be done.

The French Government considers it vital that the constitutional negotiations resume as soon as possible, despite the difficulties. In that connection it welcomes the contacts that have taken place between the parties with a view to achieving that objective. In particular, we welcomed with satisfaction the results of the 26 September meeting between the South African

(Mr. Ladsous, France)

Government and the African National Congress (ANC), the timetable for transition proposed by President De Klerk, and the subsequent progress. France calls on all the parties to cooperate fully towards the rapid resumption of negotiations and the holding, as soon as possible, of elections open to all South Africans.

Efforts to put an end to the violence are also of paramount importance. In that connection, full respect for the National Peace Accord by all its signatories is vital if calm is to be restored throughout the country. We hope all the parties will meet their commitments and will try to avoid any action liable to increase tension.

The international community must continue to encourage dialogue and to help the South Africans to overcome the difficulties they face. In that regard, the French Government reiterates its full support for the action taken by the United Nations pursuant to Security Council resolutions 765 (1992) and 772 (1992), and in particular the sending of observers to take effective action to stop the violence, in coordination with the machinery created under the National Peace Accord. We also welcome the sending of observers, including a number of my fellow countrymen, by several other organizations, including the European Community.

My delegation was pleased to note that several of the draft resolutions submitted to the Assembly took better account of developments in South Africa than did texts adopted at previous sessions, and more accurately reflected the constructive climate now prevailing in the General Assembly with respect to this and other questions.

(Mr. Ladsous, France)

In this respect we wish to pay a tribute to Mr. Ibrahim Gambari, Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, for the positive role he has played and for his efforts to submit to the Assembly texts more likely to contribute to our common objective: the elimination of apartheid by peaceful means.

In the light of those considerations, the French delegation this year voted in favour of draft resolution A/47/L.29, on the programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid. In taking that position, we express the hope that the positive trend in our work on South Africa, to which I have just referred, will be strengthened and will be extended to all draft resolutions submitted for consideration.

Ms. STRÖM (Sweden): As in previous years, Sweden voted in favour of the draft resolution on the oil embargo against South Africa. We regret, however, that unlike the consensus omnibus resolution just adopted, the resolution on the oil embargo does not sufficiently reflect the developments that have taken place in South Africa.

Mr. SÖKMENSÜER (Turkey): Turkey has always supported the efforts for the total elimination of apartheid and has always underlined that apartheid cannot be reformed, but only dismantled. We believe that there is now a much better prospect than before of a new, democratic and non-racial South Africa, because the process of creating a negotiating framework towards the end of apartheid has now reached a new stage.

A most encouraging step in that direction was the 26 September 1992 meeting and the agreements reached during that historic meeting on a number of issues.

(Mr. Sökmensüer, Turkey)

In our view, the challenge for us now is to strike a balance between the current pressures and the positive steps. In that context, Turkey is convinced that draft resolutions submitted to the Assembly should also reflect the new spirit of consensus and the positive atmosphere prevailing in the United Nations.

For that reason, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolutions A/37/L.31, A/47/L.44 and A/47/L.46, believing that portions of those draft resolutions do not correspond to the current political realities.

Mr. BACKSTRÖM (Finland): Let me first thank Ambassador Gambari for his constructive contribution to the negotiations on the text of draft resolution A/47/L.32. Finland, however, regrets that the number of draft resolutions under item 33 increased this year, and that certain texts continue to be outdated, thus obscuring the message that this body should be sending to all South Africans in support of the early establishment of a non-racial and democratic South Africa.

While Finland joined the consensus on draft resolution A/47/L.29, on the programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid, we wish to emphasize that we do not support any enlargement of the Special Committee's mandate.

(Mr. Backström, Finland)

A clear time frame for the winding up of the Committee's work should be incorporated into next year's resolution. We welcome the statement made by Mr. Gambari last Tuesday as a step in the right direction.

Mr. MOTHIBAMELE (Botswana): Botswana cast a vote in favour of draft resolution A/47/L.44. However, for reasons known to this Assembly, my delegation wishes to reserve its position with respect to the fourth preambular paragraph in which the General Assembly calls for the strengthening of the mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

Mr. YAMAMOTO (Japan): My delegation wishes to thank the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, Mr. Gambari, for preparing, in particular, draft resolution A/47/L.29, "Programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid", which we have just adopted by consensus.

This resolution is clearly a product of long discussion among the States concerned and reflects recent developments in South Africa. Japan decided to join the consensus adoption of the resolution to demonstrate its support for the peaceful efforts to eliminate apartheid in that country.

At the same time, however, I feel obliged to make it clear, with reference to paragraph 6 of the resolution, that Japan's support for the resolution does not prejudice its traditional position of not endorsing the use of the United Nations budget for particular political movements.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken by the General Assembly at its 3rd plenary meeting, on 18 September 1992, I now call on the representative of the African National Congress of South Africa.

Mr. MAFOLE (African National Congress of South Africa (ANC)): Allow me, on behalf of the African National Congress, to thank you most sincerely for giving us the opportunity to address this Assembly.

(Mr. Mafole, ANC)

The purpose of our intervention is to place on record the deeply felt appreciation of the African National Congress, and indeed the appreciation of the entire people of South Africa, for the adoption by this Assembly of all the resolutions under the item "Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa". In so doing, this body has once again - in keeping with the provisions of the Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa - unequivocally renewed its commitment to the struggle to eradicate apartheid and to create in its place a united, non-racial and democratic society.

As has become common practice, since the adoption in 1989 of the Declaration on Apartheid the General Assembly has adopted by consensus an omnibus resolution. It is also very significant that this year three more resolutions were adopted by consensus. Through these resolutions, therefore, the international community has spoken with one voice and sent a very clear signal to the regime in South Africa, as well as to the people of that country, as to its determination to realize the objectives set out in the Declaration on Apartheid.

In the course of the debate on the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa, our delegation underlined that it was the people of South Africa themselves who had the primary responsibility for addressing the situation in their country. In this regard, the African National Congress assured the Assembly that it was doing all it could to facilitate the process of negotiations and to create the climate of peace that is critical to the concentration of energies on the central task of ending the apartheid crime against humanity and transforming South Africa into a united, democratic and non-racial State. The point was also made, however, that for this noble

(Mr. Mafole, ANC)

objective to be realized speedily, the people of South Africa would continue to count on the support of the international community through its involvement in the processes aimed at bringing about the desired democratic transformation, the maintenance of existing measures designed to put pressure on the regime, and the timely and decisive intervention on the issue of violence, in keeping with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council.

It is our considered view that the omnibus resolution just adopted goes a long way towards addressing the concerns raised above. We are particularly pleased that the General Assembly, by adopting this resolution, has not only sought to complement and reinforce the efforts of the Security Council, but has also placed itself in an appropriate position to intervene actively in the processes that would unfold between now and its forty-eighth session. We are referring here to the process leading to elections for a constituent assembly to draft a new and democratic constitution, as well as to the establishment of an interim government of national unity. As indicated earlier, final decisions on these issues will be the subject of discussion at the multilateral forum, soon to be reconvened, within the framework of the Convention for a Democratic South Africa.

We should therefore like to take this opportunity to express our gratitude to all those countries that were involved in the difficult negotiations leading to the consensus text that has just been adopted. In particular, we would like to express our appreciation to the front-line States, as well as to the African Group of Ambassadors of the United Nations. We would also like to avail ourselves of this opportunity to express our appreciation to the Special Committee against Apartheid for its tireless efforts and contribution. A special word of appreciation should go to

(Mr Mafole, ANC)

Mr. Ibrahim Gambari, the Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to the United Nations and Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, for so ably assisting in building a consensus on the issue of South Africa.

With regard to the other resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, we would have been happier if they had also been adopted by consensus since, for us, all of them are extremely important and constitute an integral whole in the efforts of the international community to address the South African situation. We do, however, understand and appreciate that Member States, in taking positions with regard to specific resolutions, are guided by a number of considerations which may impel them to exercise their sovereignty in a manner which they consider to be consistent with their national interests. We are none the less gratified that the General Assembly has adopted these resolutions and has therefore reiterated its position of maintaining pressure on the South African regime and agreeing to change the status quo in tandem with the actual progress made in the negotiations. This, for us, is an important message, particularly to those circles that tend to exaggerate the progress in the political process in South Africa and erroneously conclude that apartheid is dead.

In thanking the international community for this massive support, the ANC would like to take the opportunity to state from this rostrum that we shall spare no effort to realize the objective of finally eradicating apartheid and establishing a democratic society consistent with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Charter of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT: If I hear no objection, I shall take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 33.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: If I hear no objection, I shall take it that it is also the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 34.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 36 (continued)

THE SITUATION IN CENTRAL AMERICA: PROCEDURES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A FIRM AND LASTING PEACE AND PROGRESS IN FASHIONING A REGION OF PEACE, FREEDOM, DEMOCRACY AND DEVELOPMENT

(a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/47/739)

(b) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/47/L.34/Rev.1)

(c) REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/47/799)

The PRESIDENT: May I remind representatives that the debate on agenda item 36 was held at the 80th plenary meeting on 8 December. At that same meeting, draft resolution A/47/L.34 was introduced.

(The President)

The Assembly now has before it draft resolution A/47/L.34/Rev.1. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution is contained in document A/47/799.

The following corrections should be made to the English text of draft resolution A/47/L.34/Rev.1.

The last words on the fifth line of the thirteenth preambular paragraph should read "and to bring" instead of "and to bringing".

In operative paragraph 12, the words after "to provide" in the second line should be "as appropriate from within existing resources". The rest remains as it is.

The following countries have become sponsors of draft resolution A/47/L.34/Rev.1: Brazil and the members of the European Community - Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom.

May I take it that the Assembly decides to adopt draft resolution A/47/L.34/Rev.1?

Draft resolution A/47/L.34/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted (resolution 47/118).

The PRESIDENT: We have thus concluded the present stage of our consideration of agenda item 36.

AGENDA ITEM 141 (continued)

EMERGENCY INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF WAR-STRICKEN AFGHANISTAN

(a) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/47/L.25/Rev.1)

(b) REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/47/801)

The PRESIDENT: May I remind representatives that the debate on this item was held at the 73rd plenary meeting, on 25 November. At that meeting, draft resolution A/47/L.25/Rev.1 was introduced. Members will also recall that action on the draft resolution was postponed in order to give the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee time to review the programme budget implications of the draft resolution.

The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution is contained in document A/47/801.

Mr. GHAFOORZAI (Afghanistan): On behalf of the sponsors, I should like to announce that, after a series of informal consultations, they have agreed to two modifications to the draft resolution contained in document A/47/L.25/Rev.1.

The first is to add after "so" at the end of the second line of the third preambular paragraph the words "as to contribute to" and to delete "can be ensured" at the end of that paragraph.

The second modification that the sponsors have been able to accommodate is to insert after "to evaluate" in the second line of paragraph 4 (b) the words "the situation in the light of".

The PRESIDENT: I should like to announce that the following countries have become sponsors of draft resolution A/47/L.25/Rev.1, as orally revised: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Costa Rica and the United States of America.

(The President)

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/47/L.25/Rev.1, as orally revised by Afghanistan the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly decides to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/47/L.25/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted (resolution 47/119).

The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the first speaker in explanation of vote after the voting, may I remind delegations that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. BRUMMEL (United Kingdom): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Community and its member States.

The European Community and its member States attach great importance to the reconstruction of Afghanistan and for this reason joined the consensus on the resolution. The European Community and its member States believe that the proposal in paragraph 4 (c) to convene a conference of donor States should be dependent on the evaluation to be undertaken under the terms of paragraph 4 (b), the outcome of which should not be prejudged at this stage.

Furthermore, the European Community and its member States continue to believe that items on emergency humanitarian assistance should not be routinely considered on an annual basis.

Mr. GHAFOORZAI (Afghanistan): First, may I be allowed to refer to document A/C.5/47/72 regarding the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/47/L.25/Rev.1, as orally revised which the General Assembly has just adopted. My delegation has carefully that studied by statement by the Secretary-General, submitted in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of

(Mr. Ghafoorzai, Afghanistan)

procedure of the General Assembly. The statement, which has been the subject of consideration by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ), recommended serious and substantial cuts in the budgets of the Office of the Secretary-General in Afghanistan and Pakistan (OSGAP) and the United Nations Office for the Coordination Humanitarian Assistance to Afghanistan (UNOCHA) and in their staff requirements.

We believe that the mandate given by paragraph 7 of the resolution we have just adopted calls for a series of political endeavours, as outlined and explained in paragraph 6, on page 12, of the Secretary-General's statement, for the accomplishment of which a single post at the P-5 level does not seem sufficient. As we stated in the Fifth Committee last night, my delegation would have been happier to see a smaller reduction in the staff requirements of OSGAP and UNOCHA proposed and at least a special assistant assigned the post proposed and adopted for OSGAP. We continue to believe that such a drastic cut would certainly affect the effectiveness of the United Nations in channelling humanitarian assistance as well as in monitoring the overall situation in the country.

However, my delegation accepted the recommendation in the Secretary-General's statement with the understanding that the Secretary-General will provide additional resources should circumstances require them.

The adoption of draft resolution A/47/L.25/Rev.1, as orally revised, by consensus exemplies the General Assembly's awareness of the acute and immense economic, social and financial problems the war-ravaged country of Afghanistan inherited as a result of 14 years of devastating war. It is also a manifestation of the readiness of the international community to assist in the reconstruction and rehabilitation of Afghanistan.

(Mr. Ghafoorzai, Afghanistan)

On behalf of all victims of that horrifying war, the millions of Afghans who have lost their loved ones, on behalf of 2 million disabled and crippled, on behalf of hundreds of thousands of widows and orphans, and on behalf of the Government of the Islamic State of Afghanistan, I should like to express thanks and gratitude to all those whose visible or invisible attempts, negotiations, support and understandings brought about such a consensus. A special word of thanks goes to those who were kind enough to take their support a step further in sponsoring the draft resolution. I must also express gratitude to His Excellency Ambassador Mustafa Aksin of Turkey who, on behalf of the sponsors, introduced the draft resolution.

Last but not least, the expectation of the people and Government of the Islamic State of Afghanistan will be fulfilled and the responsibilities of the world community towards Afghanistan will surely be met if practical steps are taken to implement the resolution we have just adopted. The convening of a conference of donor countries and international financial institutions to provide support for the reconstruction process would be an occasion on which the world community could take practical steps for the realization of the reconstruction objective. We appeal to donor countries to participate in that event, which, according to the statement of the Secretary-General on the financial implications of the resolution, would be held in the third quarter of 1993 in New York. It is only its generous contributions that enable the world family to assist the Afghan nation to be able to see itself once again enjoying its rights like all other free and prosperous nations that live in peace and security.

The Government of the Islamic State of Afghanistan, for its part, will continue to take very initiative and to make every effort further to

(Mr. Ghafoorzai, Afghanistan)

strengthen of the peace, security and political stability required for the accomplishment of the objectives of reconstruction and rehabilitation. Given that the present circumstances are the legacy of 14 years of war and interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, the achievement of those objectives will certainly take time. We have strong hopes that we will eventually prevail and overcome the present problems, as we have done throughout our long and turbulent history.

The PRESIDENT: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 141?

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 10 (continued)

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE WORK OF THE ORGANIZATION

(a) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/47/1, A/47/277)
(b) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/47/L.50)

The PRESIDENT: Members will recall that the debate on agenda item 10 was concluded at the 47th plenary meeting, on 27 October 1992. Members will further recall that the Assembly took note of the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization at the same meeting.

In connection with this item, the General Assembly has before it a draft resolution issued as document A/47/L.50.

In fairness to all members, I wish to consult the Assembly before we proceed to discuss and take a decision on the draft resolution before us. I should like to quote from rule 78 of the rules of procedure in regard to proposals before the Assembly:

> "As a general rule, no proposal shall be discussed or put to the vote at any meeting of the General Assembly unless copies of it have been circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting."

In view of the desire of members to dispose of this item expeditiously, I should like to seek the Assembly's concurrence with the request that we proceed to discuss and take a decision on the draft resolution contained in document A/47/L.50, even though it was distributed only this morning.

Unless I hear any objections, I shall take it that the Assembly agrees with this proposal.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: The draft resolution before us is a consensus text. I should like to point out that it is the result of informal consultations undertaken on my behalf by His Excellency Ambassador Nabil Elaraby,

(The President)

Permanent Representative of Egypt to the United Nations, as chairman of the informal open-ended working group on agenda item 10, along with His Excellency Ambassador Juan Antonio Yáñez-Barnuevo, Permanent Representative of Spain to the United Nations, as Vice-Chairman. I wish further to express appreciation to them for their productive efforts, to the representative who by their participation substantively contributed to the activities of the working group, and to the Secretariat staff, whose support facilitated the draft resolution before us today.

The creation and the activity of the informal open-ended working group are a pertinent illustration of the new global atmosphere - also evidenced in the United Nations - of cooperation that helps us face the unprecedented challenges of our time.

As a road map to many of these challenges, "An Agenda for Peace" envisages not just two roads diverging in the woods, but many less-travelled roads that we must take.

With this draft resolution, the journey has been commenced along the demanding road that may ultimately be the highway to a new world - a world vested with more security, mutual trust and peace.

As this draft resolution is the early harvest of much more labour that lies ahead, I request that the informal open-ended working group for agenda item 10, under the chairmanship of His Excellency Ambassador Nabil Elaraby and the vice-chairmanship of His Excellency Ambassador Juan Antonio Yáñez-Barnuevo, continue its work, resuming in early 1993, pursuant to part VIII of the draft resolution.

With the end of the cold war, the world needs an acting mechanism for preventive diplomacy, as well as practical levers for activation of the United Nations in the spheres of peace-keeping, peacemaking and peace-building

(The President)

activities. Therefore, the aim of the activity of the informal open-ended working group is to address more deeply the practical aspects of "An Agenda for Peace".

Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone): First of all, Mr. President, I should like to join you in thanking the Permanent Representatives of Egypt and Spain for the extensive consultations they have held and for chairing those consultations, making it possible to put this draft resolution together. I am also agreeable to your proposal that we consider this matter now in spite of the fact that rule 78 would have applied. I am prepared to accede to your request.

However, there are certain issues on which my delegation seeks your clarification, Mr. President, you have just said that the open-ended working group should continue its activities at the beginning of next year. As you are aware, the issues raised in "An Agenda for Peace" fall within the mandate of the Charter review Committee also. If the open-ended working group is going to continue to operate, I wonder what will become of the Charter review Committee and what will be the logical connection - the link - between the open-ended working group and the Charter review Committee?

I would also like to indicate that I wish to propose a number of oral amendments to draft resolution, which I saw for the first time in its final stage only this morning.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Egypt to explain the further work of the open-ended working group.

Mr. ELARABY (Egypt): As you have just indicated, Mr. President, the open-ended working group will begin its work early in 1993. I have listened to what the representative of Sierra Leone has just said and I can assure him

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

that the mandate of the open-ended working group does not conflict with the mandate of the Special Committee on the Charter. That Committee, which has been in existence for the last 14 years, if I am not mistaken, has been considering important matters related to the strengthening of the Organization. The open-ended working group will be functioning on the basis of the proposals contained in "An Agenda for Peace". In the early phase of the open-ended working group's negotiations and consultations it was made very clear by all those who expressed their point of view that other committees would continue to function according to their competence and mandates. Every effort will be made to avoid any conflict between committees and the working group.

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

Let me just touch upon the other point raised by the representative of Sierra Leone regarding what he termed "oral amendments". I have no idea what exactly he has in mind, but before he orally presents those amendments perhaps we can postpone action on the draft resolution until consultations have taken place. Draft resolution A/47/L.50, as it stands, represents a certain balance that, I can say with some confidence, has been generally accepted by all those who participated in the consultations - which were open-ended. Since I do not know what amendments the representative of Sierra Leone has in mind, I wonder whether some of the points he might raise could create some difficulties.

I would request that the matter not be decided by the General Assembly right away; perhaps we could have 15 or 20 minutes to consult on this matter.

The PRESIDENT: I think we can accept that proposal by the representative of Egypt that further discussion of this item be postponed for a few minutes. With the agreement of the Assembly, I shall now suspend the meeting.

The meeting was suspended at 12 p.m. and resumed at 12.35 p.m.

Mr. ELARABY (Egypt): I have had time to consult the Permanent Representative of Sierra Leone, and I fully understand his very valid reasons for wishing to amend the draft resolution orally. However, I explained to him the importance of keeping the text as it is. I also assured him that the valid points that he explained to me are indeed covered, in different ways, in the text I refer in particular to his point concerning the fact that the draft resolution recognizes that preventive diplomacy may require such measures as confidence-building and early-warning, and that the general aim of preventive diplomacy, as it appears in "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277) itself, is to seek to ensure that threats to the peace are removed, tensions are eased and conflicts do not deteriorate. That is the general objective of preventive diplomacy, and the draft resolution is on preventive diplomacy and related matters.

The Permanent Representative of Sierra Leone also thought that in the section on settlement of disputes we should make it clear that the Assembly does, in fact, explore, and should further explore, ways and means for a full utilization of the provisions of the Charter.

I believe that the points the Permanent Representative of Sierra Leone raised are extremely valid, but he was generous enough to recognize that they are in the text. Although he thinks that perhaps they should have been clearer, he agrees not to propose the oral amendment and that the text shall stand as it is. I am indeed grateful to him. I believe we can now, with your permission, Mr. President, take action on the draft resolution.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/47/L.50, "An Agenda for Peace: preventive diplomacy and related matters". May I take it that the Assembly decides to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/47/L.50 was adopted (resolution 47/120).

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Cuba, who wishes to make a statement in explanation of position.

Mr. MORENO FERNANDEZ (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation went along with the consensus on the draft resolution contained in document A/47/L.50, "An Agenda for Peace: preventive diplomacy and related matters". We did so basically in recognition of the excellent work done by the Permanent Representatives of Egypt and Spain in their capacities, respectively, as chairman and vice-chairman of the open-ended working group on agenda item 10, which you, Mr. President, set up. It seems to us that the working group has done some serious and constructive work, in the course of which the various opinions of participating delegations were heard and, as far as possible, taken into account, despite the great diversity in the views that were expressed - indeed, they were often contradictory - in the meetings of that body.

However, this does not mean that we no longer have serious doubts about the process now under way with a view to drawing up a number of measures suggested in the document "An Agenda for Peace", and, above all, about the way in which those measures would be implemented. We are convinced that only through strict compliance with the guiding principles of international law will it be possible to enhance the role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security.

Strict respect for national sovereignty and the sovereign equality of all States, the political independence of all nations and the principle of non-interference in internal affairs constitute the cornerstone of the entire

(Mr. Moreno Fernandez, Cuba)

activity of this Organization. Any measure adopted in accordance with the Charter must, of necessity, be based on those cardinal principles.

As my delegation has frequently said, it is also clear that every organ of the United Nations has its own mandate, and nothing that is adopted with respect to implementation of the measures contained in the document "An Agenda for Peace" can undermine the powers and functions that the Charter itself establishes or can, implicitly or explicitly, increase the power of any component part of the United Nations beyond what is necessary and appropriate. To do so would be tantamount to drawing up a completely new Charter for the Organization - something that none of us should envisage.

The resolution that we have just adopted contains elements which, if poorly handled or if approached in a partial, selective, prejudiced or non-objective way, might do harm to the basic principles to which we have referred. We hope that, together, the Secretary-General and the Members of the Organization will be capable of demonstrating that we did not make a mistake by adopting draft resolution A/47/L.50, and that its provisions, rather than responding to petty political interests, can become fair, impartial and objective instruments to be used for the preservation of international peace and security, without interference of any kind.

The PRESIDENT: We have concluded this stage of our consideration of agenda item 10.

In connection with agenda item 143, the sponsors of draft resolution A/47/L.47/Rev.1 have requested a suspension of 10 minutes so that they may conclude consultations.

The meeting was suspended at 12.45 p.m. and resumed at 12.55 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 143 (continued)

THE SITUATION IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

(a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/47/747)

(b) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/47/L.47/Rev.1)

The PRESIDENT: May I remind representatives that the debate on agenda item 143 was concluded at the 88th plenary meeting, on 15 December.

In connection with agenda item 143, the Assembly has before it a draft resolution contained in document A/47/L.47/Rev.1.

In fairness to all members, I wish to consult the Assembly before proceeding to discuss and take a decision on the draft resolution before us. I should like to quote from rule 78 of the rules of procedure with regard to proposals before the Assembly, which reads:

"As a general rule, no proposal shall be discussed or put to the vote at any meeting of the General Assembly unless copies of it have been circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting."

In view of the desire of members to dispose of this item expeditiously, I should like to seek your concurrence with the request that we proceed to discuss and take a decision on the draft resolution in document A/47/L.47/Rev.1, even though it has been distributed only this morning.

Unless I hear any objections, I will take it that the Assembly agrees with that proposal.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina, to introduce draft resolution A/47/L.47/Rev.1.

Mr. SACIRBEY (Bosnia and Herzegovina): I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution A/47/L.47/Rev.1, under agenda item 143, on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. I am pleased indeed to announce that 44 delegations have sponsored this draft resolution. I wish to extend my deep gratitude for their unconditional support.

This draft resolution confirms the views of an overwhelming majority of the citizens of the international community. It asks for no more than what every Member State is entitled to under the Charter of the United Nations: first, implementation and enforcement of the current Security Council resolutions calling for cessation of the aggression and genocide against a Member State; and secondly, a Member State's inherent right of unhindered self-defence, especially in the event that the Security Council will not or cannot take all measures necessary to maintain peace and security.

Belgrade has not abided by a single Security Council resolution or any other international agreement. Unfortunately, the responsible institutions have chosen not to act resolutely to enforce any of the agreements.

This inaction, on the one hand, and continued obstruction of the right of Bosnia and Herzegovina to self-defence, on the other, have most unfortunately been perceived by Belgrade as a lack of resolve, appeasement or - even worse - acquiescence.

Whatever the reasons behind the lack of implementation and enforcement over the last nine months, today we must be clear. Those of us who support this draft resolution must be clear about our resolve to stop "ethnic cleansing" and aggression and about our commitment to the right of self-defence for every Member State.

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

This is a message for those directly supporting or executing aggression. It is also an expression, through the General Assembly, of the international community's position. Finally, it is a clear ethical and moral message to the Security Council from the General Assembly as the conscience of the United Nations.

The Special Rapporteur stated in his report of 17 November 1992:

"The continuation of ethnic cleansing is a deliberate effort to create a fait accompli in flagrant disregard of international commitments entered into by those who carry out and benefit from ethnic cleansing. The continuation of this policy presumes the inability or unwillingness of the international community to enforce compliance with solemn agreements adopted under the auspices of the United Nations, and thus undermines the credibility and authority of international institutions. The international community cannot allow the London and Geneva agreements to continue to be systematically be ignored and violated." (A/47/666, annex, para. 135)

Some have urged that this should be a consensus resolution so as not to send the wrong message to Belgrade. We hope that this draft resolution will be adopted by consensus, but it is not sufficient to adopt a resolution that soothes our conscience, that excuses inaction or that sidesteps the urgency of the situation.

As for wrong messages to Belgrade, unfortunately, mixed signals are being sent every day. We only have to look as far as the mixed signals resonating from Brussels yesterday; or to the United Nations Protection Force troops which have been stalled by Serbian forces outside of Banja Luka for over

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

40 days, while, within the city's perimeters, a winter carnival of ethnic cleansing is celebrated.

The causes underlying this aggression are not centuries old, based on religion, or complicated. To quote again from the Special Rapporteur's report of 17 November 1992,

> "The conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina is not a religious conflict, but one which is fomented by certain nationalist groups and parties in order to further their own political and material interests." (A/47/666, annex, para. 146)

Similarly, I submit to you that the solutions to the aggression against the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina may be difficult or even demanding, but the options are morally, legally, politically and practically very clear.

Unless we act today to send the right message to the Security Council, the destruction and genocide in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina will continue for years. They will continue to haunt the conscience of this Assembly.

I ask the members of this Assembly today to muster all the moral courage we possibly can and to send the right message by consensus. Our conscience will finally be at peace, and the destruction and genocide in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina will finally be stopped.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to consider draft resolution A/47/L.47/Rev.1. Before calling on the first speaker in explanation of vote before the voting, may I remind delegations that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

I now call on the representative of the Russian Federation.

Mr. SIDOROV (Russian Federation) (interpretation from Russian): The Russian Federation, like the world community at large, is profoundly alarmed at the Yugoslav crisis, particularly the continuing tragedy in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Unfortunately, the efforts made by the United Nations, by the Security Council, by the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia, the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) and the European Community have so far not yielded the hoped-for normalization of the situation and a stop to the bloodshed. At the same time, as we see it, it would be wrong - and indeed not factually correct - to assert that these efforts have been without results. It is our expectation that the contacts and talks between the belligerents will in the final analysis lead to a genuinely durable cease-fire and mark the beginning of an effective process of political settlement in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

I should like once again to emphasize that there is no rational alternative to a peaceful political settlement of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina on the basis of mutual agreement between the parties. Attempts on the part of those involved to solve the problem by force will only lead - as we have already learned from bitter experience - to an intensification of the conflict. What could be the possible result of a new upsurge of armed conflict which for the peaceful population of Bosnia and Herzegovina has already meant incalculable suffering and which has turned one of the most beautiful spots in Europe into ruins? Only fresh devastation and an increase in the already vast flow of refugees and - what is most terrible - an

(Mr. Sidorov, Russian Federation)

intensification of mutual hostility and hatred among neighbours who only recently were living in peace and friendship. This, then, is the cost of aggressive nationalism, and it is the duty of the world community not to permit any further spread of this plague of the end of the twentieth century.

(Mr. Sidorov, Russian Federation)

However, the prevalent mood of the draft resolution before the General Assembly in document A/47/L.47/Rev.1 is clearly one of force, and almost nothing is said about the need to go on with the peaceful process of settling the Bosnian crisis. Its one-sided and ultimatum-like tone is hardly likely to have a normalizing impact on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the light of the actual state of affairs.

In particular, we cannot agree with that part of the draft resolution which calls for lifting the arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina that was imposed pursuant to Security Council resolution 713 (1992). We believe that we should heed the views held by the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the International Conference to the effect that, if that were to happen, there would inevitably be a worsening of the situation and an escalation of hostilities.

For all these reasons, the delegation of the Russian Federation cannot support the draft resolution before us and will abstain when it is voted on. We shall continue to stand consistently for the speedy cessation of the fratricidal war for and a peaceful political settlement of the Bosnian crisis.

Mr. TURK (Slovenia): Slovenia will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/47/L.47/Rev.1, and we should like to make the following statement.

The delegation of Slovenia has, throughout the consideration of agenda item 143, on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, advocated the need for the General Assembly to adopt the pertinent draft resolution without a vote. We urged the sponsors and delegations that had difficulties with the draft resolution to find appropriate and clear language that would render a vote on it unnecessary.

(Mr. Türk, Slovenia)

The reasons for this effort were explained in the debate and need not be repeated in detail. However, let us reiterate that considerations of moral coherence, intellectual accuracy and political responsibility call for unified action - and we emphasize "action" - by the international community with the objective of putting an end to the aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina. As we said in the debate, the number of victims - by far mostly civilians, the level of destruction and the extent of political danger thus created permit no obfuscation of the facts and call for unity of action, in particular action that will save the lives of people in danger.

Those are the reasons why the delegation of Slovenia will vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted in document A/47/L.47/Rev.1. The draft resolution to be adopted calls for action, and rightly so. Action is needed, as it has become clear that the force of words will not suffice to stop the aggression.

We note with regret that the efforts of the sponsors, which we encouraged, to find appropriate language of compromise did not result in an agreement and that a vote on the draft resolution has been requested. Nevertheless, we hope that the number of those who were hesitating has been reduced and that the draft resolution will command the broadest possible support of the Members of the United Nations.

Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone): In his address to the Assembly on 23 September this year, the Head of State of Sierra Leone expressed grave concern over events as they were unfolding in Bosnia and Herzegovina. He dreaded, in particular, the emerging evidence of insidious and systematic forms of nationalism or religious intolerance, euphemistically referred to as ethnic or political "cleansing", reportedly taking place in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

However, given the long-standing ties of friendship between Sierra Leone and all the people of the former Yugoslavia, Sierra Leone's firm commitment to the peaceful settlement of international disputes and our belief that a negotiated solution was still feasible in the Yugoslav conflict, the Head of State of Sierra Leone appealed to all the parties to the conflict, including Serbia and Montenegro, to bury the hatchet and intensify their efforts to bring the conflict to a peaceful resolution, thus preventing more bloodshed and further loss of innocent lives. It is therefore a matter of deep regret and grave concern for the Sierra Leone delegation that, despite our plea for a peaceful, negotiated settlemt to the conflict, Bosnia and Herzegovina, a Member of this Organization, has continued to be dismembered through force of arms, and today more than 60 per cent of its territory is reported to be under some form of military occupation.

The dreadful practice of religious or ethnic intolerance in Bosnia and Herzegovina has continued unabated. Such practices challenge the fundamental purposes and principles of the Charter of this Organization and have rightly been rejected by the international community as constituted by this Organization.

The Sierra Leone delegation is, in like manner, convinced that the aforementioned policies and practices constitute a serious threat to international peace and security. The use of force by one State against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of another, the continued emergence of overwhelming evidence of a deliberate and systematic practice of religious intolerance - or "cleansing", as it is called - violate not only the principles of the Charter of this Organization but also the Nuremberg Principles, which have become enshrined in international humanitarian law, and could constitute sufficient basis for crimes of genocide and crimes against

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

humanity, if and when it is decided to prefer those charges against the perpetrators.

The Sierra Leone delegation therefore strongly deplores the offences now being perpetrated against Bosnia and Herzegovina and its people. While the frustration of the Government and the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina at not being provided with arms to defend themselves is fully understandable, the Sierra Leone delegation is in no doubt that the safeguarding of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina remains the responsibility of the Security Council, and, in any case, it is our view that increasing the flow of arms to the conflict area will not bring the peace we all desire.

We therefore join in calling on the Security Council, as custodian of international peace and security, to shoulder its full responsibility towards the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina and take all necessary measures to end the conflict. Bosnia and Herzegovina must not be allowed to become extinct, as this will portend a grave threat not only to regional peace but, indeed, to international peace and security itself. Federal Yugoslavia must respect international law and the law of this Organization. My delegation therefore once again, even at this late hour, calls on all the parties to the conflict to hearken to the call of the international community and find a negotiated settlement of this ongoing conflict.

For all those reasons, and more, the Sierra Leone delegation - because it is faithful to the principles of the Charter of this Organization, because of its abiding opposition to the use of force in international relations, which

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

is contrary to the Charter of the Organization, and in the light of the serious violations of the principles of humanitarian law now taking place in Bosnia and Herzegovina - will firmly vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/47/L.47/Rev.1.

Mr. RICHARDSON (United Kingdom): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Community and its Member States.

We fully support the basic objectives of the draft resolution before us - namely: putting an end to inhumane practices in Bosnia and Herzegovina; resisting attempts to change borders by force and create ethnically homogenous States; and restoring peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina and preserving its unity, sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. We agree that the primary responsibility for the conflict and its brutality lies with the present leadership of Serbia and of the Bosnian Serbs.

As was made clear in the European Community's statement in the debate in the Assembly, the European Community has been at the forefront of efforts to bring the conflict to an end and to meet the humanitarian needs of the Bosnian people. We recognize that much more needs to be done. Unfortunately, the text presented to us commends to the Security Council certain policy decisions that are not fully consistent with the policies agreed by the European Heads of Government meeting in Edinburgh last weekend and supported by the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the joint European Community/United Nations International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia. I refer in particular to paragraph 7 of the draft.

Against that background, we regret that we are unable to support the text. There are also reservations on paragraphs that do not entirely take into account the competences of the Security Council.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): The Australian Government remains deeply concerned at the tragic situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We condemn the continued attacks on Sarajevo and the fighting in other parts of Bosnia and

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Herzegovina, which have resulted in disruptions of the delivery of humanitarian supplies, causing great suffering.

We also deplore the practice of "ethnic cleansing", which is a grave violation of the principles of international law and human rights. The Australian Government calls on all parties to the fighting to abide by the various cease-fire arrangements and to end this senseless bloodshed.

We therefore strongly support the draft resolution's aims of bringing the violence in Bosnia and Herzegovina to an end, stopping the grave violations of human rights that have been taking place, and restoring peace and stability to that country and to the region.

It is for those reasons, those central and compelling reasons, that we shall vote in favour of the draft resolution before the Assembly.

Having taken this careful decision to support the draft resolution, we want it to make clear that we are not sure that lifting the arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina would facilitate a peaceful resolution to the fighting. We are concerned that the lifting of the embargo could exacerbate the level of fighting and result in further death and suffering. We want to see a peaceful solution to this tragedy and an end to the fighting. We believe that these outcomes will be dependent in considerable measure on international pressure on the parties concerned to bring them to the negotiating table, and we support the maintenance of such pressure.

Furthermore, we believe that every effort should continue to be made to prevent the fighting from spreading to other areas and involving other countries.

We strongly support the actions taken to date by the Security Council to limit and end the fighting in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We are confident that

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

the Security Council will authorize appropriate enforcement action if it is deemed necessary to secure compliance with existing resolutions and will achieve the broader objectives of restoring peace and maintaining humanitarian relief.

Mrs. FRECHETTE (Canada): The Government of Canada supports the objectives of the draft resolution before the General Assembly on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We wish to see an end to the fighting, an end to the hateful practices such as "ethnic cleansing" being employed in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the restoration of peace and order.

We do not believe, however, that the lifting of the arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina would facilitate the return to peace and stability in that country. For this reason, Canada will abstain on the draft resolution.

It is long-standing Canadian policy that arms sales into areas of tension or war should cease. Canada's position on this matter is reinforced by the devastation that has already occurred in Bosnia and Herzegovina, at least in part because of the plentiful supply of arms in the region.

Canada supports vigorously the London Conference process and the work of the Co-Chairmen. We strongly support the actions taken today by the Security Council to end the fighting in Bosnia and Herzegovina and to assist its civilians with humanitarian relief. Canada urges the Security Council to undertake enforcement measures deemed necessary to secure compliance with existing resolutions and to achieve the broader objectives of maintaining humanitarian relief and restoring peace.

Mr. MONGBE (Benin) (interpretation from French): Benin, in keeping with its tradition as a country of many faiths and its wish to be a land that respects and promotes human rights and international humanitarian law,

(Mr. Mongbe, Benin)

has condemned and continues to condemn all cruel, inhuman and degrading practices in the former Yugoslavia. But what is happening in Bosnia and Herzegovina under the guise of war - which we in Benin find equally reprehensible - is beyond any explanation or analysis and can be described only as human folly or bestial behaviour on the part of human beings.

Despite all the efforts that have been made by the international community - particularly the United Nations, the European Community, the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the Organization of the Islamic Conference - the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina is looking each day more and more like a human tragedy that could well engulf the entire Balkans area.

This tragedy, which has entailed human butchery, gross violations of human rights, rape, the intolerable displacement of people and the abhorrent practice of "ethnic cleansing", is shameful for mankind. What is happening in Bosnia and Herzegovina must therefore be sincerely condemned and combated. I say "sincerely condemned and combated" because the territorial integrity of that sovereign country, a Member of the universal Organization, must be defended and preserved by firm action, action that is moreover in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations - and there's the rub.

My delegation is very seriously concerned at the measures been proposed in operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/47/L.47/Rev.1.

(Mr. Mongbe, Benin)

It is disturbing that by this paragraph the Assembly would authorize the import of arms into a country that is at war. The argument of self-defence that this implies does not stand up to close analysis, for there is no precedent in the annals of the United Nations. It would be a pity if the main organ of the system encouraged an action that is contrary to the spirit of the Charter. That is why my delegation, sadly, finds itself obliged to abstain on this draft resolution, which, if it did not contain paragraph 7, would send a firm message to all those who believe they can still settle problems of the survival of nations by the force of arms.

My delegation is not really convinced that the course mapped by this draft resolution will in fact bring peace to the former Yugoslavia, which is an integral part of the Balkans - a region that has more than once in history been the theatre of the collective expression of human hatred. The delegation of Benin favours a peaceful solution to the Bosnian tragedy, as it does for all conflicts.

On Sunday, 20 December, elections, which my delegation hopes will be free and democratic, will take place in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia - Serbia and Montenegro. The entire world expects good results - good for the people of that country, for all of the former Yugoslavia, for the Balkans and for the international community, as the hopes expressed by major world leaders, such as the President-elect of the United States, Mr. Bill Clinton, and President Boris Yeltsin of the Russian Federation, suggest. So why should not the General Assembly show a little patience, act with its customary wisdom and recommend that at this stage the Security Council explore the real causes of

(Mr. Mongbe, Benin)

the failure to implement, or of the misapplication of, its resolutions on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and remedy the situation in accordance with international law and the Charter of the United Nations?

Mr. SREENIVASAN (India): My delegation supports the just struggle of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to safeguard its sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and unity. We fully endorse the demand for an immediate cessation of hostilities and total and unconditional withdrawal of all foreign forces from the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Security Council, which has the primary responsibility for international peace and security, has taken a number of measures to bring peace to the former Yugoslavia. The draft resolution rightly commends the untiring efforts and bravery of the United Nations Protection Force, under the command of Lieutenant-General Satish Nambiar. We agree that it is necesssary for the Council to consider further measures in the face of the untold suffering of the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina. We hope and trust that these measures will be considered by the Security Council at the appropriate time.

Draft resolution A/47/L.47/Rev.1 urges the Security Council to consider enforcement measures under Chapter VII. We fully support this decision, as we have made clear repeatedly in the Security Council itself. However, we believe that such measures should be considered strictly in conformity with the Charter and that enforcement measures should be taken under the command and control of the United Nations.

Unfortunately, paragraph 7 (a), urges the Security Council to authorize Member States to take certain measures. This is clearly outside the purview

(Mr. Sreenivasan, India)

of the Charter, and we are not in a position to support it. We had intended to request a separate recorded vote on the phrase "to authorize Member States", in paragraph 7 (a), to enable us, and perhaps others, to record our position on it. If there were such a separate vote, we would abstain on it and vote for the resolution as a whole.

The sponsors of the draft resolution, who considered our suggestion that there be a separate vote on the phrase "to authorize Member States", felt that such a step would create difficulties in the adoption of the resolution and requested us not to insist on such a procedure. In deference to their wishes, we have agreed not to resort to a separate vote on the phrase, which presents serious difficulties for my delegation. In the circumstances, regrettably, we are left with no choice but to abstain on the draft resolution.

I would like to make it clear that our vote does not detract from our support for the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina in its struggle to preserve its sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity.

Mr. O'BRIEN (New Zealand): After very careful reflection, New Zealand will abstain on the draft resolution. We have not found this decision easy. We fully appreciate the intent and purpose behind this draft resolution and that of its sponsors. We share completely the grave concern over the outrages to humanity and the violation of territorial integrity in Bosnia. Our voting position today does not in any way call this into question.

New Zealand acknowledges that efforts of the international community so far have been aimed at helping to create a situation in which the conflict will end and the suffering can be eased. New Zealand believes that the work of the Co-Chairmen of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia continues to merit the fullest support, and our voting decision today - difficult as it has been for us - reflects that view.

Mr. VILLEGAS (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The tragic situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina causes the Mexican Government grave concern. In the debate on 24 August this year my delegation took the opportunity to express its vigorous condemnation of the policy of "ethnic cleansing" and other violations of human rights, as well as the acts of aggression committed in an effort to acquire the territory of that Republic - a State Member of our Organization - and to destroy or undermine its political independence, self-determination and sovereignty.

Mexico today joins the international community in condemning aggression, violence and repression. These practices are reminiscent of the darkest periods of history, particularly in this century and in the same region of the Earth. We support the vigorous appeals to all parties directly or indirectly involved in the aggression against the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina to cease their aspirations to domination and extermination.

(Mr. Villegas, Mexico)

The community of nations cannot and must not remain passive in the face of acts that are unworthy of all of us as members of the human family. The draft resolution presented to this Assembly for its consideration contains points with which my delegation fully concurs. We would highlight the urgent need for compliance with the resolutions that the Security Council has adopted with a view to ending this tragic situation. The very authority of the Council and therefore its capacity for and its effectiveness in remedying situations of this nature are being challenged. There is no doubt that if we fail to restore to the legitimate instruments of the international community their capacity to act, we shall have no hope of halting and reversing such situations as are now besetting the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

However, we cannot agree to recommend the adoption of measures that depart from the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. We know that, unfortunately, there are precedents for action of this kind, and Mexico maintains reservations about those.

Restoration of sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and unity to the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina is a task which we cannot shirk and which must be carried out in strict compliance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

At the same time, it is incumbent on the international community, and specifically on the negotiating bodies within it, to provide protection for the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina through resolute and vigorous action to curb aggression. We should give the negotiating forums the necessary opportunity and should avoid adopting measures that can lead only to an endless spiral of violence.

(Mr. Villegas, Mexico)

For all the reasons that I have outlined, my delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/47/L.47/Rev.1. Our abstention will be an expression of support for a solution within the parameters of the Charter of the United Nations. We call on the parties to continue negotiating in good faith within the framework of the International Conference. As we see it, that is the best - indeed, the only - way of achieving the firm and lasting peace for which Bosnia and Herzegovina legitimately yearns and which we resolutely support.

Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu): What is occurring in Bosnia and Herzegovina is one of the great tragedies to befall the human race. Words are incapable of describing the reprehensible conduct that has claimed so many victims. Mass murder, rape and the systematic pillaging of any people anywhere in the world must be condemned, strenuously resisted and vigorously opposed by all members of the international community. Our failure to do so would indeed be a very sad commentary on the level of human civilization as we approach the twenty-first century.

The draft resolution on which we shall vote today - document A/47/L.47/Rev.1 - is not perfect. Very few, if any, draft resolutions ever are. In particular, we are troubled by the language of operative paragraph 7. To us, that paragraph approaches certain limits that we feel are of questionable legality under the Charter of the United Nations.

We have very carefully weighed and reflected upon our concerns over the language of that paragraph and over the continued outrages against humanity being committed in Bosnia and Herzegovina, even as we deliberate here today. We have concluded that a strict interpretation of the words of the draft

(Mr. Van Lierop, Vanuatu)

resolution that trouble us allows the draft to pass legal muster; therefore, we shall vote in favour of it despite its imperfections. We shall cast our vote with a prayer in our hearts that the adoption of the draft resolution will send an important signal to the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina and will help, rather than inflame and further provoke, the situation in a very troubled region of the world.

Mr. GUILLEN (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): Peru will vote in favour of draft resolution A/47/L.47/Rev.1 because the draft reflects the general feeling of mankind and of most Member States. In this connection, we believe that the draft resolution is not a recommendation that will violate the spirit of article 12 of the Charter of the United Nations rather, it is an appeal, duly tempered by the recent amendments, relating to the pressing need for United Nations action to bring about the urgent solutions that are required.

The draft resolution is, in our view, not an ultimatum either. It is an appeal for immediate action to deal with a situation concerning which, for much too long, there have been obvious doubts and hesitations, which are being strongly criticized by public opinion the world over.

Furthermore, we are of the opinion that the conduct of the Serbian authorities constitutes deliberate, and thus far unpunished, violation of the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and that it is reminiscent of those criminal and inhuman practices inflicted on mankind that were the very reason for the creation of the United Nations. We cannot still the clamour of international public opinion and the growing impatience at the impunity of the perpetrators and our passivity.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/47/L.47/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen

Against: None

Abstaining: Angola, Argentina, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mexico, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

The draft resolution was adopted by 102 votes to 0, with 57 abstentions (resolution 47/121).

The meeting rose at 1.50 p.m.